



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
BEAUMONT DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

VS.

CASE NO. 1:07-CR-235

STANLEY T. BURRELL

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATION ON GUILTY PLEA  
BEFORE THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

By order of the District Court, this matter was referred to the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge for administration of a guilty plea and allocution under Rules 11 and 32 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. Magistrates have the statutory authority to conduct a felony guilty plea proceeding as an “additional duty” pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(3). *United States v. Bolivar-Munoz*, 313 F.3d 253, 255 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002), cert. denied, 123 S. Ct. 1642 (2003).

On October 30, 2008, this cause came before the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge for entry of a guilty plea by the defendant, Stanley T. Burrell, on **Count Two** of the charging Indictment filed in this cause. Count Two of the Indictment charges that on or about October 5, 2005 and continuing through on or about November 28, 2005, in the Eastern District

of Texas, and elsewhere, Stanley T. Burrell, Defendant herein, knowingly made a material claim against and upon the Federal Emergency Management Agency, an agency of the United States, for Hurricane Katrina disaster related assistance, knowing that the claim was false, fictitious, and fraudulent in that it falsely stated that his primary residence, located at 1403 Milton Street, Apartment C, New Orleans, Louisiana, sustained damages as the result of Hurricane Katrina rendering it unliveable, and that Hurricane Katrina also caused damage to his personal property, when in truth and in fact, the defendant did not reside at 1403 Milton Street, Apartment C, New Orleans, Louisiana, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 287. *See Indictment.*

Defendant, Stanley T. Burrell, entered a plea of guilty to Count Two of the Indictment into the record at the hearing.

After conducting the proceeding in the form and manner prescribed by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11 the Court finds:

- a. That Defendant, after consultation with counsel of record, has knowingly, freely and voluntarily consented to the administration of the guilty plea in this cause by a United States Magistrate Judge in the Eastern District of Texas subject to a final approval and imposition of sentence by the District Court.
- b. That Defendant and the Government have entered into a plea agreement which was disclosed and addressed in open court, entered into the record, and placed under seal.
- c. That Defendant is fully competent and capable of entering an informed plea, that Defendant is aware of the nature of the charges and the consequences of the plea, and that the plea of guilty is a knowing, voluntary and freely made plea. Upon addressing the Defendant

personally in open court, the Court determines that Defendant plea is voluntary and did not result from force, threats or promises. *See FED. R. CRIM. P. 11(b)(2).*

d. That Defendant's knowing, voluntary and freely made plea is supported by an independent factual basis establishing each of the essential elements of the offense and Defendant realizes that his conduct falls within the definition of the crimes charged under 18 U.S.C. § 287.

#### **STATEMENT OF REASONS**

As factual support for Defendant's guilty plea, the government presented the following evidence. *See Factual Basis and Stipulation.* In support, the Government would prove that Defendant, Stanley T. Burrell, is one and the same person charged in the Indictment and that the events described in the Indictment occurred in the Eastern District of Texas and elsewhere. The Government would also have proven, beyond a reasonable doubt, each and every essential element of the offense alleged in the Indictment through the testimony of witnesses, including expert witnesses, and admissible exhibits. Specifically, the Government would prove the following stipulated facts through the following evidence:

United States Postal Inspection Service Postal Inspector Nathan L. Curry, would testify, and the results of his investigation regarding a Federal Emergency Management Association (FEMA) claim relating to Hurricane Katrina filed by Defendant Stanley T. Burrell would demonstrate, that, on or about October 5, 2005, from a location within the Eastern District of Texas, Defendant Stanley T. Burrell applied for FEMA benefits relating to what he falsely claimed to be his primary residence, namely, 1403 Milton Street, Apartment C, New Orleans,

Louisiana, and indicating that he was in need of emergency assistance relating to his evacuation from said residence. This residence was in fact not his primary residence as he had falsely claimed. Based on this materially false statements and claims, United States Treasury checks numbered 2221-74630124 in the amount of \$2,358 dated October 15, 2005 and 2221 24440803 dated November 23, 2005, were issued to Defendant Burrell. On March 13, 2006, Defendant Stanley T. Burrell, in an interview with Postal Inspector Curry, acknowledged that he had received the FEMA check and stated, among other things, that he was basically homeless prior the hurricane.

Defendant, Stanley T. Burrell, agreed with the above-stated facts. Counsel for Defendant and the Government attested to Defendant's competency and capability to enter an informed plea of guilty. The Defendant agreed with the evidence presented by the Government and personally testified that he was entering his guilty plea knowingly, freely and voluntarily.

#### **RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION**

**IT IS THEREFORE** the recommendation of the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge that the District Court accept the Guilty Plea of Defendant which the undersigned determines to be supported by an independent factual basis establishing each of the essential elements of the offense charged in **Count Two** of the charging **Indictment** on file in this criminal proceeding. The Court also recommends that the District Court accept the plea agreement.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is further recommended that, Defendant, Stanley T. Burrell, be

---

<sup>1</sup>"(3) Judicial Consideration of a Plea Agreement.

(A) To the extent the plea agreement is of the type specified in Rule 11(c)(1)(A) or (C), the court may accept the agreement, reject it, or defer a decision until the court has reviewed the presentence report.

(B) To the extent the plea agreement is of the type specified in Rule 11(c)(1)(B), the court must advise the defendant

finally adjudged as guilty of the charged offense under Title 18, United States Code, Section 287.

Defendant is ordered to report to the United States Probation Department for the preparation of a presentence report. At the plea hearing, the Court admonished the Defendant that the District Court may reject his plea and that the District Court can decline to sentence Defendant in accordance with the plea agreement, the federal sentencing guidelines and/or the presentence report because the sentencing guidelines are advisory in nature. The District Court may defer its decision to accept or reject the plea agreement until there has been an opportunity to consider the presentence report. *See* FED. R. CRIM. P. 11(c)(3). If the Court rejects the plea agreement, the Court will advise Defendant in open court that it is not bound by the plea agreement and Defendant may have the opportunity to withdraw his guilty plea, dependent upon the type of the plea agreement. *See* FED. R. CRIM. P. 11(c)(3)(B). If the plea agreement is rejected and Defendant still persists in the guilty plea, the disposition of the case may be less favorable to Defendant than that contemplated by the plea agreement. Defendant has the right to allocute before the District Court before imposition of sentence.

---

that the defendant has no right to withdraw the plea if the court does not follow the recommendation or request.

(4) Accepting a Plea Agreement. If the court accepts the plea agreement, it must inform the defendant that to the extent the plea agreement is of the type specified in Rule 11(c)(1)(A) or (C), the agreed disposition will be included in the judgment.

(5) Rejecting a Plea Agreement. If the court rejects a plea agreement containing provisions of the type specified in Rule 11(c)(1)(A) or (C), the court must do the following on the record and in open court (or, for good cause, *in camera*):

(A) inform the parties that the court rejects the plea agreement;

(B) advise the defendant personally that the court is not required to follow the plea agreement and give the defendant an opportunity to withdraw the plea; and

(C) advise the defendant personally that if the plea is not withdrawn, the court may dispose of the case less favorably toward the defendant than the plea agreement contemplated.” FED. CRIM. P. 11(c)(3)-(5).

## **OBJECTIONS**

Within ten (10) days after receipt of this report, any party may serve and file written objections to the report and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings of facts, conclusions of law and recommendations contained within this report within ten (10) days after service shall bar an aggrieved party from *de novo* review by the District Judge of the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendations, and from appellate review of factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the District Court except on grounds of plain error. *Douglass v. United Serv. Auto. Ass'n.*, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The constitutional safeguards afforded by Congress and the courts require that, when a party takes advantage of his right to object to a magistrate's findings or recommendation, a district judge must exercise its nondelegable authority by considering the actual evidence and not merely by reviewing and blindly adopting the magistrate's report and recommendation. *See Hernandez v. Estelle*, 711 F.2d 619, 620 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983); *United States v. Elsoffer*, 644 F.2d 357, 359 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981) (per curiam).

**SIGNED this the 30th day of October, 2008.**



KEITH F. GIBLIN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE